

United States Patent and Trademark Office

HIA

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/656,801	09/04/2003	Manish Pandey	CA7038422001	7106
23639 75	590 12/12/2006		EXAMINER	
BINGHAM, N	MCCUTCHEN LLP		DO, THUAN V	
THREE EMBA 18 FLOOR	RCADERO CENTER		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	SCO, CA 94111-4067		2825	
			DATE MAILED: 12/12/200	6

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)		
Office Action Summary		10/656,801	PANDEY ET AL.		
		Examiner	Art Unit		
		Thuan Do	2825		
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failui Any r	CORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DAISIONS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, eply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tirr vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	l. ely filed the mailing date of this communication. O (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status					
2a)□ 3)□	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>29 Sec</u> This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final.			
	on of Claims				
5)⊠ 6)⊠ 7)⊠ 8)□	Claim(s) 1-18,20 and 63-70 is/are pending in the 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) 63-70 is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-3, 20 is/are rejected. Claim(s) 4-18 is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or on Papers	vn from consideration.			
10)⊠ 11)□	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on 16 June 2006 is/are: a) Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	☑ accepted or b)☐ objected to drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119				
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
Attachment		4.□ (4.4.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1	(DTO 442)		
2) Notice 3) Inform	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) · No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	te		

Application/Control Number: 10/656,801 Page 2

Art Unit: 2825

DETAILED ACTION

1. This non final office action is responsive to elected restriction dated on 09/29/2006 and amendment dated 06/16/2006. Claims 1-18,20,63-70 are pending in this office action. Claims 19, 21-62 have been canceled.

Thanks to the applicant's interview on 12/04/2006 without any result. The remarks have been considered but not persuasive. The new search found the prior art of Martin et al., pat no. 6931611 that also discloses the feature of persistent caches which is standing for an adaptor containing information from previous equivalency check as defined in the application abstract. Therefor, the following rejection is made.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1- 3, 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable over the prior art of Martin et al. Pat. No. 6931611.

Regarding claim 1: The prior art teaches a method comprising: solving at least a first equivalence checking problem (col. 1, lines 31-43); storing at least a first solution to at least the first equivalence checking problem (col. 1, lines 31-43 using the modeling output as a storage of solutions. This area is also used to reject the feature of claim 20); and

Application/Control Number: 10/656,801 Page 3

Art Unit: 2825

reusing at least part of the first solution to the first equivalence checking problem for a second equivalence checking problem (col. 2, lines 7-21using the reference model as reusing the solutions including the first solution),

wherein the first solution includes one or more algorithm traces (The algorithm traces in specification on paragraph [0014] is defined as values at intermediate points in the algorithm, and/or the final results obtained, which is termed the algorithm trace. Martin uses 'the value of intermediate comparison points at various times" in comparison with a reference model (first solution) in verification checking system in col. 2, lines 7-21 that meets the claimed limitation including the persistent caches which is defined in the abstract of application as an intermediate value for an equivalency check).

Regarding claim 2: The prior art teaches a method with combinational circuits (col. 1, lines 31-43).

Regarding claim 3: The prior art teaches a method with sequential circuits (col. 5, lines 16-45 using state holding elements).

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 4-18 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The reason for allowance is that the prior art of record does not teach the "first solution includes one or more problem signatures" with all other features of the independent claim.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 63-70 are allowed. The reason for allowance is that the prior art of record fails to teach the "problem signatures" with combination of all other features of the independent claim.

CONTACT INFORMATION

Page 4

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thuan Do whose telephone number is 571-272-1891. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:30-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jack Chiang can be reached on 571-272-7483. The fax phone numbers for proceeding this application is 571 273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 800-786-9199.

Thuan Do

Muando

Primary examiner

12/05/2006